

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. 10/700,314 | Applicant(s) GUEGLER ET AL | |
| | Examiner Prema M. Mertz | Art Unit 1646 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Prema M. Mertz (Primary Examiner). (3) ____.
- (2) Eve Frank (Attorney). (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 21 June 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 11,31,32,34 and 36-43.

Identification of prior art discussed: U.S. Patent No. 6,692,920.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Prema Mertz
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: It was indicated to Eve Frank that the antibody claims elected (claims 11, 31, 32, 34, 36-43) in response to the restriction requirement precipitated a statutory double-patenting rejection. Attorney requested Examiner not to send out an office action on the elected claims. Within 2 weeks, Attorney Frank would submit a supplemental amendment canceling the pending claims and adding new claims drawn to the elected antibody in an effort to obviate a statutory double patenting rejection.